Date: Tue, 27 Apr 93 04:30:02 PDT

From: Packet-Radio Mailing List and Newsgroup <packet-radio@ucsd.edu>

Errors-To: Packet-Radio-Errors@UCSD.Edu

Reply-To: Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu

Precedence: Bulk

Subject: Packet-Radio Digest V93 #115

To: packet-radio

Packet-Radio Digest Tue, 27 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 115

Today's Topics:

HF Fwding ARRL Petition the net version 2.09

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu> Send subscription requests to: <Packet-Radio-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu> Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Packet-Radio Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/packet-radio".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 26 Apr 93 04:53:17 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!wupost!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!

news.csuohio.edu!sww@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: HF Fwding ARRL Petition

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

SB SYSOP @ ALLUS < NO8M \$28313 NO8M HF Autoforwarding ARRL Petition R:930426/0422z 28313@N08M.#NEOH.OH.USA.NA

There are two active processes that affect packet radio under consideration by the FCC. The first deals with the responsibility of the originator and first forwarder as to message content. The second deals with the formation of HF forwarding subbands for automatic operation.

The first appears to be of little concern. We hold all messages that come into our PBBS. (Yes, even those that will not be forwarded. We will be responsible for the automated retransmission. We must therefore hold any message originated on our system.)

The second may or may not be of concern. During the FCC and

ARRL forums at the Dayton Hamvention, it was stated that a petition was filed by the ARRL on April 16 requesting a NPRM for HF autoforwarding subbands. I have asked my Section Manager for a copy of this petition.

When someone files a petition with the FCC, there is a 30 day period in which comments can be made. The FCC may then issue a NPRM which begins a second comment period. It is during the second comment period when we normally get involved. However, this FIRST 30 day period is also open for comments as to if the FCC should even open a NPRM.

This will effect HF packet, Pactor, Clover, RTTY MSOs, and DX Packet Cluster links and all forms of communications where a control operator is not present at BOTH sides of the link.

I was chagrined to find the normal rabid anti-HF operation from the DXers. Severely limited subbands will be as terminal to their HF Cluster links as it will to Clover. As is normal, the manufacturers were unconcerned.

This information is presented for your consideration. 73, Steve

It must be noted that at Dayton there was virtually no discussion about HF packet. Others buzzed with excitement over Clover, the announcement of the new Pactor II, DSP units, etc. etc. It certainly looked like HF packet is stagnant, old, RTTY-like mode that was unworthy of comment or concern.

/EX

Date: 26 Apr 93 01:43:26 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!wupost!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!csd.unb.ca!

caadams@network.UCSD.EDU Subject: the net version 2.09

To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

hi,

does any one know where i can find the latest version of thenet. i think the latest is v2.09

thanks in advance, kenny caadams@upei.ca

kenny adams

charlottetown prince edward island canada

```
caadams@atlas.cs.upei.ca
standard disclaimers apply....
Date: 25 Apr 93 18:02:07 CDT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!ukma!netnews.louisville.edu!wkuvx1!
scottcr@network.UCSD.EDU
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu
References <1qevrf$4t@hpscit.sc.hp.com>, <1qf44aINNll@rave.larc.nasa.gov>,
<1993Apr23.191808.10835@rwwa.COM>
Subject : Re: Cable TVI interference
In article <1993Apr23.191808.10835@rwwa.COM>, witr@rwwa.COM (Robert Withrow)
writes:
> In article <1qf44aINNll@rave.larc.nasa.gov>, watson@nimbus.larc.nasa.gov
(Catherine Watson) writes:
> | I gave up after a year of
> | letters and phone calls. I got the impression the FCC was powerless and it
> | was up to the cable company to correct the situation.
>
> Isn't there some *formal* action a citizen can take that *requires* the
> FCC to, at least, generate some paperwork?
> --
> Robert Withrow, Tel: +1 617 598 4480, Fax: +1 617 598 4430, Net: witr@rwwa.COM
> R.W. Withrow Associates, 21 Railroad Ave, Swampscott MA 01907-1821 USA
```

For those who are interested, the FCC does indeed care about cable leakage, particularly into the aviation nav band, or leakage that is "causing interference to other services".

Part 76.611 details specific limits to acceptable leakage, and measurement technique. If you will clearly document your problem, and measurement technique (a signal level meter with dipole is the normal approach, remember to correct between measurement data and microvolts per meter) and fax or mail the details to Mr. John Wong Cable Branch, FCC 1919 M st. NW Wash DC, and a copy of your letter to the local cable company, you will get results. In fact the cable company will probably start treating you much better when they realize you have figured out how to get the FCCs attention.

What is important is to document your case as it relates to the applicable rules. However the cable company *is required* to at least check out every complaint of leakage. They must file with the commission and maintain on premises a yearly measurement

report that details the results of leakage testing.

But remember, call the cable company first, and give them a chance to work to correct the problem before contacting the commission.

I am in the business of measuring cable system leakage via the airborne method.

- -

SCOTTCR@WKUVX1.BITNET aka Chris Scott-Telco: (502) 745-3834
